



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,625	04/27/2001	Martin Morris	WIDC-019/00US	2405
7590 Christopher C. Winslade McAndrews, Held & Malloy 500 W. Madison Street Suite 3400 Chicago, IL 60661		04/03/2007	EXAMINER LEE, CHI HO A	
			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

5K

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/844,625	MORRIS, MARTIN	
	Examiner Andrew Lee	Art Unit 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2006.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 16-23 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 10-15 and 24-28 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**ANDREW C. LEE**  
**PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER**

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION*****Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greaves et al U.S. Patent Number 7,7072,056.

Re Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 16, 17, 24, and 25, fig. 1 teaches a Jetsend sending device 12 (an electronic system; Personal Computer) communication with a Destination Device (a device) 14 via Jetsend Gateway device 10 (an interface unit), wherein communication protocol A is between 12 and 10 (a second protocol) and communication protocol B is between 10 and 12 (a first protocol). The Jetsend Gateway Device includes communication protocol B (a device communication module) for communicating with the Destination device using communication protocol B (the first protocol) and communication protocol A (a system communication module) for communicating with the Jetsend sending Device using the communication protocol A (the second protocol) (See col. 4, lines 43 +). Fig. 3 teaches the detail function of the CPU 24 (a translation unit) whereby the CPU is operatively connection to both protocols for performing the protocol translation. Greaves fails to explicitly teach the communication protocol B (first protocol) is wireless. However, Greaves teaches that the various

communication protocol can be used for communication between the devices (See col. 2, lines 60-65). One skilled in the art recognizes that IEEE LAN also includes wireless LAN protocols. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to modify the wired LAN protocol with the wireless protocol to enable device to be mobile within the range of the WLAN. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled to modify the communication protocol to wireless to be mobile.

In view of the “wherein the electronic system does not have to be aware of the first protocol to be in communication with the device”, the Jetsend sending device (the electronic system) does not have to be aware of the WLAN protocol (the first protocol) to be in communication with Destination device (the device) because the translation performed by the Jetsend Gateway Device.

3. Claims 3-7, 10, 13-15, 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greaves et al U.S. Patent Number 7,7072,056 in view of Bork U.S. Patent Number 6,255,800.

Re Claims 3, 13, Greaves fail teaches that the fails to teach, “the second protocol is USB to connect with the Jetsend Gateway. However, Bork teaches in fig. 14, the PC10 connected to the 46 over USB. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to include the translation function of Bork into the CPU of Greave to be adaptive to different protocols. One skilled in the art recognizes advantages of implementing the USB connectivity includes having rapid transfer ratio, easily-mount, hot-plug, and supporting various peripheral devices, that further includes most all PC system and notebook system.

Re Claims 4, 19, and 26, further teaches the Bluetooth LM & LC (a peripheral detection and connection module).

Re Claims 5, 20, and 27, Bork teaches fig. 19, a Bluetooth radio (a Bluetooth radio) operatively connected to the LM & LC (the peripheral detection and connection module) and Bluetooth HC (the communication module) wherein 46 shows a Bluetooth protocol stack.

Re Claims, 6, 21, wherein the Bluetooth protocol supports multiplexing/demultiplexing over the LM layer, wherein the arrangement is further connected to the Bluetooth/USB firmware (the translation unit).

Re Claims 7, 10, 28, Bork teaches a fig. 19, the USB Device Controller (a USB interface) operatively connected to the USB Firmware (the USB protocol stack), wherein the protocol stack is modified into the Gateway of Greave.

Re Claims 14, 15, wherein the Bluetooth protocol enables Service Discovery protocol to detect the type of device.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 16-23 are allowed.
5. Claims 8, 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

In combination with claims 1, 7, 8, prior art fails to teach the USB multiplexing/demultiplexing.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 1/27/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Re Claims 1, 11, 24, applicant argues that, "wherein the electronic system does not have to be aware of the first protocol to be in communication with the device". However, Examiner disagrees.

"wherein the electronic device...does not have to be" is optional language, See MPEP 2111.04[R-3]. Hence, it is optional whether the electronic device does or does not have to be aware.

In view of Greaves, the Sending device (electronic device) does not have to be aware of the communication protocol (first protocol) of Destination device (the device) because protocol translation is performed by the Gateway.

In particular, Applicant argues that Sending device is aware of the communication protocol that destination device is using. Examiner disagrees. Had the Sending device was "aware" of the communication protocol of the destination device; the Gateway would have not been needed. Meaning, had the communication protocol was known, the sending protocol would have translated the communication protocol accordingly.

Applicant argues that Greaves does not teach any advantage for mobility. This advantage is recognized over one ordinary skilled.

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-3130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on 571-272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

\*\*\*

**ANDREW C. LEE  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "ANDREW C. LEE".